

The Honorable Barbara J. Rothstein

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

PAWANDEEP DHUNNA,)	No.: 2:21-cv-00720-BJR
)	
Plaintiff,)	STIPULATED MOTION AND ORDER TO
)	CONTINUE DEADLINES
vs.)	
)	
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND)	
SECURITY, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

STIPULATION

Plaintiff Pawandeep Dhunna and Defendants the Department of Homeland Security, *et al.*, through their respective counsel, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6 and Local Rules 10(g) and 16, and hereby jointly stipulate and move for a 90-day extension of (1) the deadline for Defendants to respond to the Complaint, and (2) the deadlines in the Court's order (Dkt. #10) that sets dates for the exchange of Initial Disclosures and filing a Combined Joint Status Report and Discovery Plan.

A court may modify a deadline for good cause. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b). Continuing pretrial and trial dates is within the discretion of the trial judge. *See King v. State of California*, 784 F.2d 910, 912 (9th Cir. 1986).

The parties submit there is good cause for an extension of the deadlines as there was when

the parties submitted their previous stipulated request for an extension of the deadlines (Dkt. #7, 9). As the parties explained then, statutory authorization related to the EB-5 regional center program (the program under which the plaintiff filed an I-526 petition) expired at the end of the day on June 30, 2021. The lapse continues. Due to this lapse in authorization, in general, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (“USCIS”) will not act on any pending Form I-526 petition that is dependent on the lapsed statutory authority until further notice. See <https://www.uscis.gov/working-in-the-united-states/permanent-workers/eb-5-immigrant-investor-program> (second alert). In addition, “[a]lthough USCIS is unable to review [the plaintiff’s Request for Evidence] response at this time, [USCIS] will . . . maintain the response for review if circumstances change.” A 90-day extension will give the parties time to monitor whether Congress will renew the statutory authorization related to the regional center program and to assess the impact of such reauthorization (or lack thereof) on this litigation. Continuing the existing deadlines for a responsive pleading, initial disclosures, and a joint status report will allow the parties to conserve resources because they will not have to expend resources completing work on the case that may become moot (or the issues may change) depending on whether Congress renews the statutory authorization related to the program.

Therefore, the parties agree to and propose new deadlines as follows:

Action	Deadline
Defendants’ responsive pleading	May 9, 2022
Rule 26(f) Conference	April 25, 2022
Exchange initial disclosures	May 2, 2022
File Joint Status Report	May 9, 2022

//

1 IT IS SO STIPULATED, THROUGH COUNSEL OF RECORD.

2 DATED: January 19, 2022

s/ Gabrielle D. Schneck

Gabrielle D. Schneck, WSBA #45448

Millar & Hayes, PC

2633 Eastlake Avenue E., Suite 300

Seattle, WA

Phone: 206.262.0561

gabrielle@usborderlaw.com

Attorney for Plaintiff

8 DATED: January 19, 2022

NICHOLAS W. BROWN

United States Attorney

s/ Michelle R. Lambert

MICHELLE R. LAMBERT, NYS#4666657

Assistant United States Attorney

United States Attorney's Office

1201 Pacific Avenue, Suite 700

Tacoma, WA 98402

Phone: (253) 428-3824


Email: michelle.lambert@usdoj.gov

Attorney for Defendants

ORDER

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 27th day of January, 2022.


BARBARA J. ROTHSTEIN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE